

REMARKS

The above amendments are made in response to the Office action of April 30, 2009. The Examiner's reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 1-16 are pending in the present application. Claims 11-15 have been withdrawn leaving claims 1-10 and 16 for consideration. Claims 1-10 and 16 stand rejected. Claim 1 has been amended and claim 10 has been canceled. Support for the amendments to claim 1 may be found at least in canceled claim 10 and FIGS. 1, 5-7 and 9-11 of the application as filed. No new matter has been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In order for an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art; that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references; and that the proposed modification of the prior art must have had a reasonable expectation of success, determined from the vantage point of the skilled artisan at the time the invention was made. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *Amgen v. Chugai Pharmaceuticals Co.*, 927 U.S.P.Q.2d, 1016, 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1996). See MPEP 2143.

Claims 1-3, 5-8 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshihara (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0011739, hereinafter "Yoshihira") in view of Jang et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0112388, hereinafter "Jang"). The Examiner states that Yoshihira discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims except for a light reflective-transmissive unit disposed between the light supplying unit and the LCD panel assembly, which is allegedly disclosed in FIGS. 4 and 5 of Jang.

First, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 10, which admittedly defines over Yoshihira in view of Jang.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that neither Yoshihira nor Jang disclose that that **“the light guide plate has a plurality of receiving recesses formed on the side surfaces to partially receive the light source”**, as claimed in amended claim 1 of the present invention.

Thus, neither Yoshihira nor Jang, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest a light guide plate including a light-exiting surface facing the light supplying unit, a light reflecting surface facing the light-exiting surface and a side surface connecting the light reflecting surface to the light-exiting surface, wherein the light guide plate has a plurality of receiving recesses formed on the side surfaces to partially receive the light source, as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Thus, Applicants submit that neither Yoshihira nor Jang, either alone or in combination, render obvious the subject matter of amended claim 1. Claims 2-9 and 16 depend from amended claim 1, and thus include the allowable elements of amended claim 1. It is thus believed that the dependent claims are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons given above for amended independent claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claimed invention is allowable over the cited references. The Examiner's withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-8 and 16, and their subsequent allowance is respectfully requested.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshihira and Jang, and further in view of Fukuzawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,249,328, hereinafter “Fukuzawa”). The Examiner states that Yoshihira and Jang disclose all of the elements of the abovementioned claim except for each of the red light supplying unit, the green light supplying unit and the blue light supplying unit comprising a cold cathode

fluorescent lamp (CCFL), which is allegedly disclosed in col. 1, line 51 – col. 2, line 8 of Fukuzawa.

First, it is respectfully submitted that claim 4 depends from claim 1, which is submitted as being allowable for defining over Yoshihira in view of Jang as discussed above. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that use of a CCFL supplying red, green and blue light allegedly disclosed in Fukuzawa, or any other disclosure of Fukuzawa, does not cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Yoshihira and Jang.

Thus, neither Yoshihira, Jang nor Fukuzawa, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest a light guide plate including a light-exiting surface facing the light supplying unit, a light reflecting surface facing the light-exiting surface and a side surface connecting the light reflecting surface to the light-exiting surface, wherein the light guide plate has a plurality of receiving recesses formed on the side surfaces to partially receive the light source, as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Thus, Applicants submit that neither Yoshihira, Jang nor Fukuzawa, either alone or in combination, render obvious the subject matter of amended claim 1. Claims 2-9 and 16 depend from amended claim 1, and thus include the allowable elements of amended claim 1. It is thus believed that the dependent claims are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons given above for amended independent claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claimed invention is allowable over the cited references. The Examiner's withdrawal of the rejection of claim 4, and its subsequent allowance are respectfully requested.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshihira in view of Jang and further in view of Tsuda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,106,400, hereinafter "Tsuda"). The Examiner states that Yoshihira and Jang disclose all of the elements of the abovementioned claim except for the pixels comprising a transparent electrode and a reflective electrode having a contact hole through which the transparent electrode is exposed, which is allegedly disclosed in FIGS. 15 and 16 of Tsuda.

First it is respectfully submitted that claim 9 depends from claim 1, which is submitted as being allowable for defining over Yoshihira in view of Jang as discussed

above. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that use of pixels comprising a transparent electrode and a reflective electrode having a contact hole through which the transparent electrode is exposed allegedly disclosed in Tsuda, or any other disclosure of Tsuda, does not cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Yoshihira and Jang.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claim 9 under §103 be withdrawn and allow the same to issue.

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshihira and Jang and further in view of Moon (U.S. Patent No. 6,480,247, hereinafter “Moon”). The Examiner states that Yoshihira and Jang disclose all of the elements of the abovementioned claim except for a light reflecting surface facing the bottom light-exiting surface of the guide plate, which is allegedly disclosed in FIG. 8B of Moon.

First it is respectfully submitted that the limitations of claim 10 have been rewritten into amended independent claim 1, while claim 10 has been canceled, rendering any rejection thereto moot. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that use of a light reflecting surface facing the bottom light-exiting surface of the guide plate allegedly disclosed in Moon, or any other disclosure of Moon, does not cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to Yoshihira and Jang.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that Moon discloses independent light sources corresponding to three primary colors are replaced by a single light source, so that light utilization efficiency may be optimized and a slim-type LCD may be provided. (Abstract). Thus, Moon **teaches away** from a light supplying unit having independent light sources corresponding to red light, green light and blue light, respectively, as recited in independent claim 1. Moreover, Moon teaches away from the conventional color-filterless LCD since it has to turn on the three primary color independent light sources during a short period, and the number of light sources as well as a size of the light source driver is increased. (Column 2, line 65- column 3, line 2).

In addition, with respect to the sequentially turning on the three primary colors, Moon merely discloses that when any one of the three color light sources 12R, 12G, and 12B has been turned on, other color light sources are turned off or have a minimum

brightness. When such sequential turned-on times are controlled to have a very short time interval, an observer does not sense a turning on and off of the displayed image, but views a full color image. (Col. 2, lines 48-54). As discussed above, Jang does not disclose independent light sources corresponding to red, green and blue colors.

Lastly, it is respectfully submitted that neither Yoshihira, Jang nor Moon disclose that that **“the light guide plate has a plurality of receiving recesses formed on the side surfaces to partially receive the light source”**, as claimed in amended claim 1 of the present invention.

Thus, neither Yoshihira, Jang, nor Moon, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest a light guide plate including a light-exiting surface facing the light supplying unit, a light reflecting surface facing the light-exiting surface and a side surface connecting the light reflecting surface to the light-exiting surface, wherein the light guide plate has a plurality of receiving recesses formed on the side surfaces to partially receive the light source, as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claim 10 under §103 be withdrawn and allow the same to issue.

Conclusion

In light of the above remarks, the present application including claims 1-9 and 16 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections. If there are any charges due with respect to this response, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130 maintained by Applicants' Attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /James J. Merrick/
James J. Merrick
Registration No. 43,801
Cantor Colburn LLP
20 Church Street, 22nd Floor
Hartford, CT 06103-3207
PTO Customer No. 23413
Telephone: (860) 286-2929
Fax: (860) 286-0115

Date: August 10, 2009